



**PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of: Mittal et al.

Application No: 10/676,724

Filed: September 30, 2003

Title: Systems and Methods for Searching  
Using Queries Written in a Different  
Character-Set and/or Language From  
the Target Pages

Attorney Docket No. GOOGP006

Examiner: Chen, Te Y.

Art Unit: 2161

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 6, 2007.

Signed: 

Name: Jung-hua Kuo

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Applicant requests review of the final rejection mailed on March 6, 2007 in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheets (3 pages).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the:

- ☒ attorney or agent of record. Registration Number 41,918.  
☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration Number \_\_\_\_\_.  
☒ If the required fees are missing or any additional fees are required during the pendency of the subject application, please charge such fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1217 (Order No. **GOOGP006**). A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



September 6, 2007

Date

Jung-hua Kuo  
Reg. No. 41,918  
P.O. Box 3275  
Los Altos, CA 94024  
Telephone: (650) 988-8070  
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of: Mittal et al.

Application No: 10/676,724

Filed: September 30, 2003

Title: Systems and Methods for Searching  
Using Queries Written in a Different  
Character-Set and/or Language From  
the Target Pages

Attorney Docket No. GOOGP006

Examiner: Chen, Te Y.

Art Unit: 2161

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 6, 2007.

Signed: 

Name: Jung-hua Kuo

**Reasons For Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The reasons for the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review are set forth below.

**In rejecting claims 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Examiner did not establish that Hargrave discloses, teaches, or suggests each and every element of the claimed inventions so as to render the claims anticipated**

Claims 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as obvious over Bash et al. in view of Spinazzola and further in view of Hergatt.

Independent claim 14 generally recites a search method that generally includes obtaining a query written in a first format from a user, translating the query from the first format into a second format using a probabilistic dictionary, the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first format to the second format, searching a database for information responsive to the translated query, and returning search results written in the second format to the user.

Hargrave discloses a translation memory base on an aligned file having source language text strings paired with target language text strings. Hargrave deals with a software

implementation for machine assisted translation (Abstract, lines 1-3 and col. 1, lines 10-13). Hargrave does not disclose nor does Hargrave suggest translating “a query written in a first format from a user” into “a second format using a probabilistic dictionary, the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first format to the second format,” “searching a database for information responsive to the translated query”, and “returning search results written in the second format to the user.” (Quoting independent claim 14 with emphasis added).

The Examiner contends that Hargrave discloses “translating the query into a second format *using a probabilistic dictionary*” in that Hargrave’s Translation Memory (TM) system of FIG. 1 encodes the query language in text format into a *computer readable format*. For example, Hargrave states that “a text sample to be analyzed is coded in a computer readable format in step 101 shown in FIG. 1,” and one commonly used computer readable format is ASCII (col. 6, lines 1-8). In other words, the Examiner reads Hargrave’s computer readable format as being the “second format” of claim 14.

However, Hargrave’s “translation” of the query in the first format to the computer readable format does not utilize “a probabilistic dictionary” as recited in claim 14. As is well known in the art, coding into a computer readable format is performed “using a particular, usually standardized codeset” (col. 6, lines 5-7). It would hardly be desirable to code a query in a first language to the computer readable format using a probabilistic dictionary as generally recited in claim 14.

Moreover, given that the computer readable format is the “second format” (as interpreted by the Examiner), Hargrave does not “return search results written in the second format [i.e., computer readable format such as ACSII] to the user” as recited in claim 14 as such a step would require Hargrave to return search results written in the computer readable format (e.g., ASCII) to the user, which Hargrave does not do nor would such a step be desirable or useful in any way.

Withdraw of rejection of independent claim 14 as well as claims 15-21 dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Because the Examiner’s rejections of claims 14-21 include legal deficiencies with regard to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and the MPEP, Applicants are entitled to a pre-appeal brief review of the

final rejection. And based on the foregoing arguments, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **50-1217** (Order No. **GOOGP006**).

Respectfully submitted,



September 6, 2007

Date

---

Jung-hua Kuo  
Reg. No. 41,918  
P.O. Box 3275  
Los Altos, CA 94024  
Telephone: (650) 988-8070  
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090